

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO |). I | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | | |
|----------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| 10/736,190 | | 12/15/2003 | Stephen F. Gross | U 0210 CC/CSAP | 4381 | | |
| 23657 | 7590 | 04/18/2005 | | EXAM | EXAMINER | | |
| | CORPOR | - | MRUK, BRIAN P | | | | |
| | DEPARTM OKSIDE A' | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | | |
| AMBLER | , PA 1900 | 02 | 1751 | | | | |
| | | | | DATE MAILED: 04/18/2005 | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | Applicatio | n No. | Applicant(s) | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------|---|----------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | 10/736,19 | 0 | GROSS ET AL. | | | | | | |
| | Office Action Summary | Examiner | | Art Unit | | | | | | |
| | | Brian P. M | uk | 1751 | | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | | | | | |
| Status | • | | | | | | | | | |
| 1)⊠ | 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 February 2005. | | | | | | | | | |
| | This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final. | | | | | | | | | |
| 3)□ | Since this application is in condition for | allowance except t | or formal matters, pro | secution as to th | e merits is | | | | | |
| | closed in accordance with the practice $\boldsymbol{\iota}$ | under <i>Ex par</i> te Qua | ayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45 | 3 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ | 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | | | | |
| | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | | | | |
| 5)□ | 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-3,5-17 and 19-28</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| · — | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8)∟ | 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | | | | |
| Applicati | on Papers | | | | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10) | 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | | |
| | Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Priority u | ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 222 m. 3 diagonou district district a list of the contined copies not received. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Attachment | t(s) | | | | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO- | | Paper No(s)/Mail Da | te | 0.153) | | | | | |
| | nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTC r No(s)/Mail Date <u>2-3-05</u> . | | 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other: | аселі Арріісайол (РТ | J-192) | | | | | |

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-3, 5-17 and 19-28 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-28 of copending Application No. 10/879,340. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant application and copending Application No. 10/879,340 claim a similar composition and method for cleaning a hard surface with a composition comprising from about 1.0 to about 15.0% by weight of a monoethanolamine salt of an alkyl sulfonic acid (i.e. an anionic surfactant), from about 3 to about 50% by weight of a C₁₋₄ alkyl ester of a C₆₋₂₂ saturated or unsaturated carboxylic acid primary solvent, from about 1.0 to about 15.0% by weight of a short-chain cosurfactant, from about 1 to about 25% by weight of a polar

Application/Control Number: 10/736,190 Page 3

Art Unit: 1751

solvent having a water solubility of from about 1 to about 5 g/100 ml, up to about 10.0% by weight of a nonionic surfactant, from about 0.05 to about 3.0% by weight of a thickening agent selected from the group consisting of hydroxypropyl cellulose, hydroxypropyl methylcellulose, and mixtures thereof, and water to balance (see claims 1-28 of copending Application No. 10/879,340), per the requirements of claims 1-3, 5-17 and 19-28 of the instant invention. Although copending Application No. 10/879,340 claims a similar composition and method for cleaning a hard surface, they are not identical, because copending Application No. 10/879,340 requires a specific anionic surfactant (i.e. a monoethanolamine salt of an alkyl sulfonic acid), whereas the instant claims require any anionic surfactant. Therefore, claims 1-3, 5-17 and 19-28 of the instant invention are an obvious formulation in view of claims 1-28 of copending Application No. 10/879,340.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 4 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of

Application/Control Number: 10/736,190 Page 4

Art Unit: 1751

instant claims 4 and 18.

the base claim and any intervening claims. Specifically, the prior art of record does not teach or suggest in general a hard surface cleaning composition that contains an isopropylamine salt of a linear alkylbenzene sulfonate acid, as required by applicant in

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Mruk whose telephone number is (571) 272-1321.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra Gupta, can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

BPM Brian Mruk April 12, 2005

> Brien P. Mrux Brian P. Mruk **Primary Examiner** Tech Center 1700